

# *Mathematical Journal of Okayama University*

---

*Volume 26, Issue 1*

1984

*Article 21*

JANUARY 1984

---

## On completely torsionfree modules

Hisao Katayama\*

\*Yamaguchi University

Copyright ©1984 by the authors. *Mathematical Journal of Okayama University* is produced by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress). <http://escholarship.lib.okayama-u.ac.jp/mjou>

## ON COMPLETELY TORSIONFREE MODULES

Dedicated to Professor Hiroshi Nagao on his 60th birthday

HISAO KATAYAMA

In this paper we shall consider some module theoretic generalizations of completely torsionfree rings ([4, p.91]), and study those rings whose modules are completely torsionfree (CTF). We refer for the definitions and basic properties concerning preradicals and torsion theories to [8, Chap. VI].

All rings occurring are associative and possess an identity element. All modules are unitary left modules. Let  $R$  be a ring. We write  ${}_R M$  to indicate that  $M$  is an object in the category  $R\text{-mod}$  of all left  $R$ -modules. We denote by  $E(A)$  the injective hull of  ${}_R A$ . A module  $M$  is said to be strongly prime (SP) if, for each left exact preradical  $\sigma$  for  $R\text{-mod}$ , either  $\sigma(M) = 0$  or  $\sigma(M) = M$ . Also a module  $M$  is said to be 1SP if  $\sigma(M) = 0$  for every proper left exact preradical  $\sigma$  for  $R\text{-mod}$ . SP-modules was studied in Beachy and Blair [1] and 1SP-modules was studied in [4, p.114].

Now, we shall define completely torsionfree modules as follows :

**Definition.** A module  $M$  is called *completely torsionfree* (CTF) if, for each left exact radical  $\rho$  for  $R\text{-mod}$ , either  $\rho(M) = 0$  or  $\rho(M) = M$ . Further,  $M$  is called 1CTF (resp. 0CTF) if  $\rho(M) = 0$  (resp.  $\rho(M) = M$ ) for every proper (resp. nonzero) left exact radical  $\rho$  for  $R\text{-mod}$ .

**Remark 1.** (1) Let  $\rho$  be a preradical for  $R\text{-mod}$ . Then  $\rho(R) = R$  if and only if  $\rho = 1$ , where 1 stands for the identity functor for  $R\text{-mod}$ . Hence a ring  $R$  is left CTF if and only if  ${}_R R$  is 1CTF. Such a ring is also called left HRF in [2, p.160]. On the other hand,  ${}_R R$  is 0CTF if and only if there exist only two left exact radicals for  $R\text{-mod}$  (i.e.  $R$  is left HRT ([2, p. 160])), or equivalently  $R$  is left ChC in the sense that, for all nonzero cyclic left  $R$ -modules  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ,  $\text{Hom}_R(C_1, C_2) \neq 0$  holds ([4, p.96]). For characterizations of left CTF-rings, see [2, VI.1.E7] and [4, p.91], and for those of left ChC-rings, see [2, VI.2.1], [3], [4, p.96] and [7, Theorem 2.4].

(2) In [4, pp.117–119], we can find some connections between 1CTF-modules and CTF-rings.

(3) Hongan studied CTF-modules in [5, Theorem 1.3] and [6]. We notice that this result will also be obtained by using [2, I.6.4]. But we shall study in Theorem 5 the Hongan's result from our point of view. To do this and for further aims, we need next two lemmas.

Let  ${}_R M$  be a fixed module. For each  $x \in M$ , we associate the left exact preradical  $\sigma_x$  and the left exact radical  $\rho_x$  for  $R$ -mod which are defined by

$$\sigma_x = \bigwedge \{ \sigma \mid \sigma \text{ is a left exact preradical with } x \in \sigma(M) \}$$

and

$$\rho_x = \bigwedge \{ \rho \mid \rho \text{ is a left exact radical with } x \in \rho(M) \}.$$

We also associate the set  $\mathcal{L}_x$  of all left ideals  $I$  of  $R$  which contain  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx)$  for some finite subset  $F$  of  $R$ . Recall that there exists an order preserving correspondence between the left exact preradicals for  $R$ -mod and the left linear topologies on  $R$ , under which the left exact radicals correspond to the left Gabriel topologies.

**Lemma 2** (cf. [4, pp.89–90]). *Let  $x$  be an element of  ${}_R M$ . Then the set  $\mathcal{L}_x$  is the smallest linear topology containing  $\text{Ann}_R(x)$ . Moreover, the left exact preradical for  $R$ -mod corresponding to  $\mathcal{L}_x$  is just  $\sigma_x$ .*

*Proof.* It is obvious that  $\mathcal{L}_x$  is a filter. If  $I \in \mathcal{L}_x$  and  $s \in R$ , then there exists a finite subset  $F$  of  $R$  with  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx) \subseteq I$ , and so  $\text{Ann}_R(sFx) \subseteq (I : s)$ . Hence  $(I : s) \in \mathcal{L}_x$ . Now, let  $\mathcal{L}$  be an arbitrary left linear topology containing  $\text{Ann}_R(x)$ . For each  $I \in \mathcal{L}_x$ , we have some finite subset  $F$  of  $R$  with  $I \supseteq \text{Ann}_R(Fx) = \bigcap_{r \in F} (\text{Ann}_R(x) : r)$ . By the assumption of  $\mathcal{L}$ , we have  $I \in \mathcal{L}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}' \leftrightarrow \sigma_x$  and  $\mathcal{L}_x \leftrightarrow \sigma'$  be the corresponding left linear topologies and left exact preradicals. Since  $x \in \sigma_x(M)$ ,  $\text{Ann}_R(x) \in \mathcal{L}'$  and so  $\mathcal{L}_x \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ . On the other hand, since  $\text{Ann}_R(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x$ , we have  $x \in \sigma'(M)$ . Thus we obtain  $\sigma_x \leq \sigma'$  and hence  $\mathcal{L}' \subseteq \mathcal{L}_x$ . Therefore we must have  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}_x$  and  $\sigma' = \sigma_x$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $x$  be an element of  ${}_R M$ . Then the smallest radical  $\bar{\sigma}_x$  larger than  $\sigma_x$  is just  $\rho_x$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\bar{\sigma}_x$  is a left exact radical such that  $x \in \sigma_x(M) \subseteq \bar{\sigma}_x(M)$ , we have  $\rho_x \leq \bar{\sigma}_x$ . Conversely,  $x \in \rho_x(M)$  implies  $\sigma_x \leq \rho_x$  and so  $\bar{\sigma}_x \leq \rho_x$ . Hence we have  $\bar{\sigma}_x = \rho_x$ .

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $x$  be an element of  ${}_R M$ , and let  $\mathcal{G}_x$  denote the left Gabriel topology corresponding to  $\rho_x$ . Then a left ideal  $I$  of  $R$  belongs to  $\mathcal{G}_x$  if and only if, for each proper left ideal  $J$  containing  $I$ , there exists  $s \in R \setminus J$  such that  $(J : s) \in \mathcal{L}_x$ .*

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 3 with [8, Prop. VI.5.4].

For a module  ${}_R E$ , we define the radical  $k_E$  by  $k_E(X) = \bigcap \{ \text{Ker}(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \text{Hom}_R(X, E) \}$  for each  $X \in R\text{-mod}$ . It is well known that  $k_E$  is left exact whenever  $E$  is injective and every left exact radical has the form  $k_E$  for some injective module  ${}_R E$ . Now, we shall prove the next

**Theorem 5.** *The following properties of a nonzero module  ${}_R M$  are equivalent :*

- (1)  $M$  is CTF.
- (2) If  $K$  is a proper submodule of  $M$  and  $x$  is a nonzero element of  $M$ , then the next condition holds :
  - (\*) There exist  $y \in M \setminus K$  and a finite subset  $F$  of  $R$  such that  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx) \subseteq (K : y)$ .
- (3) If  $K$  is a proper submodule of  $M$  and  $x$  is a nonzero element of  $M$ , then  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(M/K)) \neq 0$ .
- (4) If  $K$  is a proper submodule of  $M$ , then  $k_{E(M/K)}(M) = 0$ , or equivalently  $M$  is cogenerated by  $E(M/K)$ .
- (5) ([5]) If  $K$  is a non-trivial submodule of  $M$ , then there exists  $v \in K$  with  $\text{Hom}_R(Rv, M/K) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Note that the condition (\*) is equivalent to the existence of  $y \in M \setminus K$  with  $(K : y) \in \mathcal{L}_x$ , or equivalently  $\sigma_x(M/K) \neq 0$  by Lemma 2. Assume that there exist a proper submodule  $K$  of  $M$  and a nonzero  $x \in M$  such that  $\sigma_x(M/K) = 0$ . Since  $\bar{\sigma}_x = \rho_x$  by Lemma 3, we have  $\rho_x(M/K) = 0$ . On the other hand, since  $0 \neq x \in \rho_x(M)$ , we must have  $\rho_x(M) = M$  by (1), and so  $\rho_x(M/K) = M/K$ . This is a contradiction.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). Let  $K$  be a proper submodule of  $M$ , and take a nonzero  $x \in M$ . By the assumption, we have a finite subset  $F = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$  of  $R$  with  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx) \subseteq (K : y)$ . Put  $u = (s_1x, \dots, s_nx) \in (Rx)^{(n)}$ . Consider a cyclic submodule  $U = Ru$  of  $(Rx)^{(n)}$ . Then we get a nonzero homomorphism  $f: U \rightarrow M/K$  given by  $f(au) = ay + K$  ( $a \in R$ ). Extend  $f$  to  $\bar{f} \in \text{Hom}_R((Rx)^{(n)}, E(M/K))$ . Hence we see  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(M/K)) \neq 0$ .

(3)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4). Clear.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (5). Let  $K$  be a non-trivial submodule of  $M$ . Take a nonzero  $x \in K$ . By the assumption,  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(M/K)) \neq 0$  and so there exists  $v \in Rx$  with  $\text{Hom}_R(Rv, M/K) \neq 0$ .

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Assume that  $\rho(M)$  is a non-trivial submodule of  $M$  for some left exact radical  $\rho$ . Then there exists  $v \in \rho(M)$  with  $\text{Hom}_R(Rv, M/\rho(M)) \neq 0$ . This is a contradiction, because  $Rv$  is  $\rho$ -torsion and  $M/\rho(M)$  is  $\rho$ -torsionfree.

**Lemma 6.** *The following conditions are equivalent for an element  $x$  of  ${}_R M$ :*

- (1)  $\rho_x = 1$ .
- (2) *For each proper left ideal  $J$  of  $R$ , there exist  $s \in R \setminus J$  and a finite subset  $F = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$  of  $R$  with  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx) \subseteq (J : s)$ . (We may take  $n = 1$ ).*
- (3) *If  ${}_R Q$  is a nonzero (cyclic) module, then  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(Q)) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2). Since  $\rho_x = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}_x \ni \{0\}$ , this is clear from Corollary 4.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). Consider a nonzero cyclic module  $Q = R/J$ , where  $J$  is a proper left ideal of  $R$ . By the assumption, there exist  $s \in R \setminus J$  and a finite subset  $F$  of  $R$  with  $\text{Ann}_R(Fx) \subseteq (J : s)$ . Now, the same argument as in the proof (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) of Theorem 5 enables us to have  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(Q)) \neq 0$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). For each proper left ideal  $J$  of  $R$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E(R/J)) \neq 0$  by using (3). Hence there exists a cyclic submodule  $Ru$  of  $Rx$  with a nonzero  $f \in \text{Hom}_R(Ru, R/J)$ . Put  $u = s_1 x$  and  $f(u) = s + J$  ( $s_1, s \in R$ ). Since  $f$  is well defined, we have the condition (2).

**Theorem 7.** *The following properties of a nonzero module  ${}_R M$  are equivalent:*

- (1)  $M$  is 1CTF.
- (2)  $\rho_x = 1$  for every nonzero  $x \in M$ .
- (3) *If  ${}_R E$  is a nonzero injective module, then  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E) \neq 0$  for every nonzero  $x \in M$ .*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Let  $x$  be a nonzero element of  $M$ . Since  $\rho_x$  is a left exact radical with  $x \in \rho_x(M)$ , we have  $\rho_x(M) \neq 0$  and so  $\rho_x = 1$  by (1).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). Let  $x$  be a nonzero element of  $M$  and  $E$  a nonzero injective module. By using Lemma 6, we see  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E) \neq 0$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Let  $\rho$  be a proper left exact radical for  $R$ -mod. Then

there exists an injective module  ${}_R E$  such that  $\rho = k_E$ . Since  $\rho \neq 1$ , we see  $E \neq 0$ . Now, for any  $x \in \rho(M)$ , we see from  $k_E(Rx) = Rx$  that  $\text{Hom}_R(Rx, E) = 0$ . Hence,  $\rho(M) = 0$  by (3) and therefore  $M$  is 1CTF.

**Theorem 8.** *The following properties of a nonzero module  ${}_R M$  are equivalent :*

- (1)  $M$  is 0CTF.
- (2) If  ${}_R E$  is an injective module with  $\text{Hom}_R(M, E) \neq 0$ , then  $E$  is a cogenerator.
- (3) If  $N$  is a proper submodule of  $M$ , then  $E(M/N)$  is a cogenerator.
- (4) If  $N$  is a proper submodule of  $M$  and  ${}_R S$  is a simple module, then  $\text{Hom}_R(S, M/N) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2). Let  $E$  be an injective module with  $\text{Hom}_R(M, E) \neq 0$ . Then  $k_E(M) \neq M$  and so, by (1),  $k_E = 0$  where 0 stands for the zero functor for  $R\text{-mod}$ . Hence, for every  $X \in R\text{-mod}$ ,  $k_E(X) = 0$  induces that  $X$  is cogenerated by  $E$ .

(2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3). Let  $N$  be a proper submodule of  $M$ . By (2),  $\text{Hom}_R(M, E(M/N)) \neq 0$  implies that  $E(M/N)$  is a cogenerator.

(3)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (1). Let  $\rho$  be a left exact radical such that  $\rho(M) \neq M$ . Then, for an injective module  ${}_R E$  such that  $\rho = k_E$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_R(M, E) \neq 0$ . Take any  $f(\neq 0) \in \text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ . By  $M/\text{Ker}(f) \cong \text{Im}(f) \subseteq E$ , we see  $E(M/\text{Ker}(f)) \subseteq E$ . Therefore, by (3),  $E$  must be a cogenerator and so we have  $\rho = 0$ .

(3)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4). Recall that an injective module  ${}_R E$  is a cogenerator if and only if  $\text{Hom}_R(S, E) \neq 0$  for all simple module  ${}_R S$ .

**Corollary 9.** *A simple module  ${}_R S$  is 0CTF if and only if  $E(S)$  is a cogenerator.*

**Corollary 10.** *The following statements are equivalent for a ring  $R$ :*

- (1) Every simple left  $R$ -module is 0CTF.
- (2) All simple left  $R$ -modules are isomorphic.

**Proposition 11.** *The class of 0CTF-modules forms a hereditary torsion class. On the other hand, the class of 1CTF-modules forms a torsionfree class closed under injective hulls.*

*Proof.* By the definition, a module is 0CTF if and only if it belongs to

the intersection of all nonzero hereditary torsion classes. Clearly this intersection forms a hereditary torsion class. The remaining part is proved in the same way.

Clearly every simple left  $R$ -module is CTF. We remark that every projective (more generally, torsionless) left  $R$ -module is CTF (or 1CTF) if and only if  $R$  is left CTF. In the next theorem we shall characterize those rings whose (injective) left modules are CTF. As proved in [4, p.118], a ring with a simple 1CTF-module is just of this type.

**Theorem 12.** *The following assertions are equivalent for a ring  $R$ :*

- (1) *Every left  $R$ -module is 1CTF.*
- (2) *Every injective left  $R$ -module is 1CTF.*
- (3) *Every simple left  $R$ -module is 1CTF.*
- (4) *Every left  $R$ -module is 0CTF.*
- (5) *Every injective left  $R$ -module is 0CTF.*
- (6) *Every projective left  $R$ -module is 0CTF.*
- (7) *Every left  $R$ -module is CTF.*
- (8) *Every injective left  $R$ -module is CTF.*
- (9) *([7]) Every nonzero injective left  $R$ -module is a cogenerator.*
- (10) *There exist only two left exact radicals for  $R$ -mod.*
- (11) *([4])  $R$  is left ChC.*
- (12) *([3])  $R$  is left semiartinian and all simple left  $R$ -modules are isomorphic.*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). Clear.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (9). Let  ${}_R E$  be a nonzero injective module. For each simple module  ${}_R S$ , since  $k_E$  is a proper left exact radical, we have  $k_E(S) = 0$ . Thus  $\text{Hom}_R(S, E) \neq 0$  and hence  $E$  is a cogenerator.

(4)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6). Clear.

(6)  $\Rightarrow$  (10). Since  ${}_R R$  is 0CTF, this follows from Remark 1.

(7)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (8). Clear.

(7)  $\Rightarrow$  (12). Assume there exists a nonzero left  $R$ -module  $M$  with zero socle. We put the left exact preradical  $\sigma = \text{soc}$  and consider the left exact radical  $\bar{\sigma}$ . For a simple left  $R$ -module  $S$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}(M \oplus S) = S$  holds and so  $M \oplus S$  is not CTF. Next, assume that  $S$  and  $T$  are non-isomorphic simple left  $R$ -modules. We put  $\rho = k_{E(S)}$ . Since  $\rho(S) = 0$  and  $\rho(T) = T$  by  $\text{Hom}_R(T, E(S)) = 0$ , we have  $\rho(S \oplus T) = T$ , and hence  $S \oplus T$  is not CTF.

(9)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (10). This was proved in [7, Theorem 2.4].

(10)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (11). This was proved in [4, p.96].

(10)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (12). This was proved in [3, Proposition 2].

(10)  $\Rightarrow$  (1), (4) and (7). Clear.

Finally we shall give an example which distinguishes 0CTF-modules, 1CTF-modules and CTF-modules.

**Example 13.** (1) Every 0CTF-module is CTF, but the converse is not true. In fact, let  $R$  be a left CTF but not ChC ring (for example, a two-sided simple ring with zero socle). Then  ${}_R R$  is 1CTF but not 0CTF by Remark 1.

(2) Every 1CTF-module is CTF, but the converse is not true. To see this, let  $R$  be a local but not right perfect ring (for example, the ring of formal power series over a field). Then the (unique) simple module  $S$  is 0CTF by Corollary 10, but since  $R$  is not left ChC ([4, p.96]),  $S$  is not 1CTF by Theorem 12.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J.A. BEACHY and W.D. BLAIR: Rings whose faithful left ideals are cofaithful, *Pacific J. Math.* **58** (1975), 1–13.
- [2] L. BICAN, T. KEPKA and P. NĚMEC: *Rings, Modules and Preradicals*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Math. **75**, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York and Basel, 1982.
- [3] B.J. GARDNER: Rings whose modules form few torsion classes, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **4** (1971), 355–359.
- [4] D. HANDELMAN, K.R. GOODEARL and J. LAWRENCE: Strongly prime and completely torsion-free rings, *Carleton Math. Series* **109**, Carleton University, 1974.
- [5] M. HONGAN: On strongly prime modules and related topics, *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **24** (1982), 117–132.
- [6] M. HONGAN: Corrigendum to “On strongly prime modules and related topics” (This Journal, vol. 24, pp. 117–132), *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **25** (1983), 195.
- [7] H. KATAYAMA: On rings for which various types of nonzero preradicals are cofaithful, *Hokkaido Math. J.* **12** (1983), 49–63.
- [8] Bo STENSTRÖM: *Rings of Quotients*, Grundle Math. Wiss. **217**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
YAMAGUCHI UNIVERSITY

(Received October 15, 1983)